

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/823,449	03/30/2001	Tg Hien	3COM-3228.US.P	5704
7590 04/13/2004			EXAMINER	
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP			ST CYR, DANIEL	
Third Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Two North Market Street			ARTONII	FAFER NUMBER
San Jose, CA 95113			2876	

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	A					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/823,449	HIEN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Daniel St.Cyr	2876				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) dwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro cause the application to become ABANDON	timely filed ays will be considered timely. m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 Ja	nnuary 2004.					
<i>'</i>	,—					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4,7-13,15,16 and 18-23 is/are pendidada of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4,7-13,15,16 and 18-23 is/are reject 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. S	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	,	•				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori	s have been received. s have been received in Applica ity documents have been receiv i (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I					
information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2876

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/26/04 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-4, 9-13, 15, 16, 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harari et al, US Patent No. 5,887,145.

Re claims 1, 10, and 21, Harari et al discloses a removable mother/daughter card comprising: a first module 10 (the card serves as a communication device) having an opening, said first module adapted to be communicatively coupled with an electronic device 200, said first module adapted to receive a second module 20; a controller 40 coupled with said first module for controlling communication between said first and second module; a first module electrical connector 12 to communicate with said electronic device; and a second connector coupled with the first module for communicating with the second module (see figures 1-3 and col. 6, line 59 +).

Art Unit: 2876

Re claims 2, 11, and 22, wherein the first module is adapted to be inserted into said accessible slot of said electronic device (see figure 1).

Re claims 3 and 12, wherein said opening of said first module is adapted to receive said module (see figure 1).

Re claim 4, 13, 23, wherein said first and second modules are communication memory devices (figure 3).

Re claims 15 and 16, wherein the memory device is digital multimedia card (see figure 4).

Harari et al disclose that components necessary for implementing wireless functionality (wireless modem) are on the daughter card and disclose that the use of a peripheral modem requires functional components on both the mother card and the daughter card (see applicant argument on page 13, line 11+). Therefore for implementing wireless functionally would also require the wireless component to be placed in the mother card also.

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Harari et al so that the cards can could communicate wirelessly. Such modification would make the system more effective and more convenient wherein data would be communicate without having the card being physically connected.

Therefore, it would have been an obvious extension as taught by Harari et al.

Re claim 9 and 20, Harari et al fails to disclose or fairly suggest that the opening of the first module is larger than accessible slot of electronic device. However, such limitation is an obvious engineering design choice to meet customers' requirements, failing to provide any unexpected results. Furthermore, these types of connection combinations are notoriously old and

Art Unit: 2876

well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been an obvious extension as taught by Harari et al.

4. Claims 7, 8, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harari et al in view of Nelson et al, US Patent No. 6,377,218. The teachings of Harari et al have been discussed above.

Harari et al teach that the communication device could be a modem (see col. 8, line 45), but fail to disclose or fairly suggest that the modem is a Bluetooth wireless modem.

Nelson et al disclose a device for providing an antenna, a receptacle, and physical connector on a type II PCMCIA card comprising a radio frequency device 200 wherein the device is a Bluetooth wireless device (see col. 3, line 60+ and col. 4, line 34+).

In view of Nelson et al's teachings, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the modem device of Harari et al into a Bluetooth wireless modem to provide connection to remote network. Such modification would facilitate connection to existing data networks by providing a bridge mechanism to interface with the data networks. Furthermore, the Bluetooth modem would able to process communication inquiries and requests without involving the host system, which would make the system more effective. Therefore, it would have been an obvious extension as taught by Harari et al.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Iwasaki, US Patent No. 5,612,532, discloses a thin IC card and method for producing

Art Unit: 2876

the same. Graves et al, US Patent No. 6,575,361, disclose a system and method for managing stored-value card data..

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel St.Cyr whose telephone number is 571-272-2407. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G Lee can be reached on 571-272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DS April 4, 2004 Daniel St.Cyr Primary Examiner Art Unit 2876